

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/790,335	WALL, JOHN W.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Matthew O. Savage	1724

**All Participants:**

(1) Matthew O. Savage.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Kevin D. Bailey.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 4 April 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103.*

**Claims discussed:**

*10, 30, 33, 35, 36, and 40.*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*Stockhowe et al, Wagner et al, and Burton.*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to amend claims 10, 30, and 35 to replace "configured as a ball" to "a spheroid-shaped member having a maximum diameter that is larger than a minimum diameter of the post, said minimum diameter being located axially between the spheroid-shaped member and the tube body" to as to more closely correspond to the original disclosure on pages 6-7 of the specification and FIG. 5 of the drawings, and to patently distinguish over the center tube structure shown in FIGS. 8-10 of Stockhowe et al.. Agreed to amend claim 33 to clarify the structural relationship of the base with respect to the closure portion. Agreed to amend pages 6 and 7 of the specification to provide antecedence for the claimed subject matter. See the attached examiner's amendment and reasons for allowance for details..